

**DRAFT**  
**Northgate Coordinated Transportation Investment Plan (CTIP)**  
**Stakeholder Sub-committee Meeting Notes**  
**May 5, 2005**

**Those in attendance:**

Marilyn Firlotte  
Jeannie Hayden  
Brad Cummings  
Bruce Kieser  
David Johnson, Transportation Solutions (consultant to NSCC)  
Barbara Maxwell  
Shaiza Danji  
Shawn Olsen  
Janice Camp  
Kenneth Meyer

**Also:**

Tony Mazzella, SDOT  
Tom Noguchi, Mirai Associates

**Key Issues/Comments:**

1. Tony provided an introduction to the meeting topic, **Project Evaluation Criteria**, and stressed the relationship between the weighted scoring system being proposed and the priority policy directions described in the Seattle Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Strategic Plan; and the scoring system being tested to rank capital projects city-wide. Specifically, the City's overall policy direction in transportation is to seek to achieve balance among travel modes with particular emphasis upon the non-SOV and transit modes. (You can see the full slide show of tonight's presentation in an attachment to this mailing).

The Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan states, "Because Seattle is a fully built city with a mature street system, the City use a full range of non-single occupant vehicle transportation facilities to support the desired redevelopment pattern within Urban Villages". For full text please see [http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Comprehensive\\_Plan\\_10-Year\\_Update/index.asp](http://www.seattle.gov/dpd/Planning/Comprehensive_Plan_10-Year_Update/index.asp)

The principle themes of the Transportation Strategic Plan Update include **Improve Safety, Preserve and Maintain Transportation Infrastructure, Support the Urban Village Land Use Strategy, Provide Mobility and Access**

**through Transportation Choices.** For full text please see  
<http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/tsphome.htm>

2. Tom and Tony reminded everyone that the ranking system was a starting point that would allow the CTIP team to screen out fatally-flawed project concepts and prioritize the remaining projects in rank order.
3. There was a great deal of discussion on the issue of mobility. Some members of the group felt that auto mobility needed to be given a greater weight because auto travel would continue to remain the preferred mode of choice for many; congestion relief benefited economic development, helped maintain safety and actually supported livability on the local streets. If the arterial streets worked well motorists would be less inclined to use local streets as an alternative. Others believed that giving all modes the same weight was consistent with the Northgate Comprehensive Plan, Council direction and current community values.
4. There was discussion of how to more clearly identify the need for sidewalk repair to support pedestrian mobility and safety.
5. It was noted that it might be helpful to consider bike storage facilities under the definition of “bike facilities”.
6. The group agreed that while individual transportation projects would have their own environmental review requirements, it was important to make some tentative judgments at the planning stage concerning potential impacts to the environment particularly the reduction of auto emissions.
7. Cost effectiveness/feasibility was seen as a critical element of the ranking system and there was some sentiment to give it additional points.
8. While several participants believed that some minor adjustments could be made to the evaluation criteria and scoring system, there was general agreement that this document was acceptable use to rank preliminary project concepts.